DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 731 EA 020 849

AUTHOR	Thompson, John A.
TITLE	The Second Wave of Educational Reform: Implications for School Leadership, Administration and Organization.
INSTITUTION	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
REPORT NO	ECS-WP-EG-86-1
PUB DATE	Sep 86
NOTE	50p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Dept., Education Commission of the States, 1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300, Denver, CO 80295 ($6.00; quantity discounts).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - General (140)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Policy; Administrator Role; Change Strategies; *Decentralization; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Excellence in Education; Inservice Education; Leadership Training; Participative Decision Making; *School Administration; School Districts; School Organization; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	Nation Prepared (A)

ABSTRACT

This paper deals with the impact of recommendations in the Carnegie report ("A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century") on administration in schools. The Carnegie report gives a bold new outline for improving teachers' roles in the schools by greatly strengthening their decision-making role and advocating a much more decentralized school organization. This paper presents a discourse on several critical issues that will be necessary to consider as the Carnegie report becomes a workable model. A major focus of this report is "empowering teachers" to have a greater decision-making role in schools. This paper discusses the importance of restructuring schools and attempts to analyze the changes necessary by categorizing the change at three levels of education: schools, school districts, and the state. Several administrative task areas are analyzed at each of these levels: management, fiscal, legal, and curriculum. A final section discusses issues in the training of future administrators. Appended are 18 references. (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE SECOND WAVE OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM: IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP, ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION

by John A. Thompson
Professor, Department of Educational Administration
University of Hawaii

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sherry F. Walker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 020 849

THE SECOND WAVE OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM: IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP, ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION

by John A. Thompson
Professor, Department of Educational Administration
University of Hawaii

Working Paper No. EG-86-1

September 1986

Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295
(303) 830-3600

Dr. John A. Thompson is a member of ECS's Steering Committee. The views expressed in this paper are his own and not necessarily those of ECS.

The Education Commission of the States is a nonprofit, nationwide interstate compact formed in 1965. The primary purpose of the commission is to assist governors, state legislators, state education officials and others to develop policies to improve the quality of education at all levels. Forty-eight states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are members. The ECS central offices are at 1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80295. The Washington office is in the Hall of the States, 444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 248, Washington, D.C. 20001.

It is the policy of the Education Commission of the States to take affirmative action to prevent discrimination in its policies, programs and employment practices.

Order additional copies from the ECS Distribution Center in Denver (303-830-3692) for $6.00 each. Ask for no. EG-86-1.

CONTENTS

Overview 1

Why is Restructuring Schools Important? 2
- A Vision of the School of the Future 4
- Revising Current Administrative Practice 6

The School Level 7
- Organizational Management 8
- Motivational Management 11
- Leadership Role of Principals and Shared Decision Making 13
- Fiscal Management 15
- Financial Considerations 18
- Personnel 20
- Legal Aspects 22
- Curriculum 23

The District Level 24
- Management 26
- Financial Considerations 27
- Legal Concerns 27
- Curriculum 28

The State Level 29
- Management and Fiscal Considerations 29
- Legal Aspects 31
- Curriculum 32

Training of Administrators 32
- Pre-Service Training 34
- In-Service Training 38

Policy Implications 39

Conclusion 44

Selected References 45

Overview

Educational writers, policy makers, and practitioners have begun to write and speak of the reform movement that is sweeping the nation in terms of "waves." The first wave, which was characterized by statutes and/or school board regulations, aimed at raising requirements for students, funneling additional state monies into efforts to enhance current salaries, and generally to tighten the system. Most policy makers believe this wave has now washed over the educational system. The second wave is often perceived as bringing more fundamental changes to American education far into the future. The proposed changes often tie improved educational output to economic productivity. The Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession has produced a report which will undoubtedly play a key role in shaping the agenda for the second wave of reform.

A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century may be the strongest hope for improving public schools of this country so that they may meet their future responsibilities. This outstanding report gives a bold new outline for improving teachers' roles in the schools by greatly strengthening their decision-making role and advocating a much more decentralized school organization. Included are sections on what a decentralized, reorganized school will look like. The report does not, however, give many clues about how school districts might get from their current organizational structure to the future. Likewise, it says almost nothing about the administrative role and/or structure that will be necessary to operate schools successfully.

As the Carnegie report becomes more widely read and accepted, attention will focus upon how its recommendations can be implemented. This paper will deal with the impact of the recommendations on administration of schools. It presents a discourse on several critical issues which will be necessary to consider as the Carnegie report becomes a workable model.

A major focus of this report is "empowering teachers" to have a greater decision-making role in schools. The concept of empowering teachers seems to imply that their new power must be taken from some other part of the educational establishment. This paper rejects that concept. Empowerment is not a zero-sum game. Rather, at least at the school level it will be a win-win situation. That is, empowering teachers will also expand and change the responsibilities of the principal.

While hopefully this paper will be of interest to school professionals, it is written for decision makers and policy makers who may not be overly familiar with the way schools are administered. Remember: almost nothing is black and white in school administration, almost everything is various shades of gray.

Why is Restructuring Schools Important?

One of the most enduring themes in the rhetoric of educational reform is the need to restructure the way schools are organized to deliver education services to students. There are several rationales for changing the human and technical structures of the schools of the future.

One is that bright, young, new teachers will be attracted into the schools only if they perceive public education as having career opportunities that will be attractive over time. Thus, it will be necessary to have schools that provide both upward mobility and special incentives for teachers whose performance is superior. Since education will be bidding against other professions for the services of a decreasing number of college graduates, it will be necessary to provide improved working conditions, salary, advancement, and the opportunity to participate in decision making if public education is to compete successfully for the top college graduates.

A second rationale proceeds from modern management theory, which holds that concepts such as mutual assistance, cooperative work relationships, an opportunity to feel that one's efforts are contributing to the achievement of the goals of the organization, and participation in goal setting (at least in one's work area) are key elements of high productivity. Raising productivity, as the term applies to elementary and secondary educators, can be equated with better student achievement, which is raison d'etre for the entire reform movement. Therefore, a school organization that has the potential for raising productivity is certainly important to students, parents and ultimately the economic health of the United States.

A third rationale for restructuring schools is to reduce bureaucracy, which the architects of the new schools believe has slowly strangled the ability of the individual attendance units to operate efficiently. For example, time, which is certainly one of the major resources of the teacher and the student, has been both manipulated and prescribed by the school district and in some cases the state to a point that many teachers have almost no flexibility to control the amount of time spent on a particular subject in an effort to meet student needs. Statutes or regulations which, for instance, require "150 minutes per week of subject X" place teachers and principals in a situation where some students are going too slowly while others need more time. Bureaucracy, which is in part founded on the concept of standardizing operations, has led to educational structures that make for easier administration but not always for better education from the teacher's point of view.

A fourth rationale deals with the locus of decision-making about financial matters. Modern business practice has placed high emphasis on quasi-independent "cost centers" where most budgeting and expending of funds occur at the lowest operating division; these centers are then held responsible for gains in productivity in relation to the freedom they have to determine how to accomplish the work. But at present the

principals and teachers do not typically have discretion over the bulk of their budget. Major expenditure items such as the number and type of teachers necessary to staff the school are often not under a principal's control, yet the principal is responsible for the productivity of the school. Thus, the ability of the teachers and/or principals to control educational outcomes may be severely hampered by not having sufficient control of expenditures at the school site (see Edmonds, 1979; Thomas and Edgemon, 1984). The Carnegie report envisions schools of the future that will have vastly expanded building-level control and expenditure authority.

Clearly these new and changing organizational aspects of the school of the future have a major effect upon the administrative subsystem of districts and schools, especially in such matters as selection, preparation, certification and development of the teaching staff, as well as the operational style that will contribute to the success of restructured schools.

A Vision of the School of the Future

One of the best descriptions of the restructured school of the future is found in the Carnegie report. The first paragraph from the section "Schools for the 21st Century: A Scenario" describes the setting:

> It is the year 2000. We are in a high school in a midwestern city serving children in a low income community. Most of the professional teaching staff have been Board certified. Many hold the Advanced Certificate issued by the Board. The professional teachers run the school with an Executive Committee of Lead Teachers in overall charge. There are many other people available to help the teachers, including paid teachers aides, technicians and clerical help; interns and residents working in the school as part of their professional teacher preparation programs; student tutors from the university, a few people on loan from nearby firms, and a retired person working as a volunteer tutor. (p. 45).

Paragraphs on p. 49 and 50-51 give a more detailed glimpse of the school of the future from an administrative point of view. The first paragraph is an interview with a mythical "head teacher" named Ms. Lopez "elected by her peers as head of the executive committee of the school."

> The conversation with the chair of the executive committee gets off to a fast start. A question about the goals of the school produces an animated monologue that lasts almost half an hour. Maria Lopez describes how the professional teachers in the schools met with the parents over six months to come to an understanding about what they wanted for their children, how they then discussed state and local standards and objectives, and then came up with a plan for their school.
>
> It was a tricky process. The teachers' plan had to address the state and local objectives for these students, and take into account what the parents wanted as well. But in the end, the objectives had to reflect what the teachers themselves thought they could and should accomplish for the students. If they set the objectives too low, they might be easily accomplished, but the teachers' bonuses would be commensurately low. Achievement of ambitious objectives would bring substantial rewards under their bonus plan, but none at all if they were not met. After long discussions with the district administrators, some objectives were set lower than the district had in mind, but others were set higher. Needless to say, the teachers were very interested in the year-end results that would be made public four weeks after the end of the spring term.

The plan included an incentive pay system based upon students' achievement of certain academic goals that had been negotiated with the district administrators; a restructuring of the school day to give teachers more time to plan; innovative methods of instruction; and a locally constructed curriculum (see pages 49-50). The scenario closes with a glimpse of where the school administrators would fit into the scheme.

> The meeting closes with a report from the school administrator hired by the teachers' executive committee last year. She has worked up a specification for specialized testing services, based on the technical information provided by the teachers with advanced training in psychometrics. The school district central office and the local office of a national firm have both submitted bids. After a short but heated debate, the teachers decide to award the contract

> to the school district, based on the great improvement in the district's technical staff and their ability to respond quickly to changing requirements.
>
> After the meeting, we get another few minutes with Maria Lopez. In response to our questions, she acknowledges that the professional teachers on her staff spend more time deciding how the school is to run than they used to. But, despite this, they have no less time to devote to instruction than before, because there are many more people around to take care of all the things which used to occupy teachers that had nothing to do with instruction. (pp. 50-51).

The scenario describes a much better trained instructional corps with teachers and building administrators in nearly complete control of developing school goals, instructional methodology, budget and working conditions. The authors of the report predict the net effect of the changes they postulate will be much higher productivity in terms of student outcomes.

While one might debate the feasibility of the Carnegie scenario, the fact remains that if all or part of it is implemented there will be an impact on the current methods of administering schools. At the very least the model implies additional administrative functions at the level of the individual school, with more persons sharing in many of the decisions.

Revising Current Administrative Practice

Assessing possible revisions of the current administrative practices of schools is not an easy task since the variance in the organization and operation of school attendance areas throughout the United States is enormous. For instance, there are schools and districts in which the Carnegie model or something similar to it are currently in operation (e.g., Cherry Creek, Colorado; Varina High School, Virginia; Westburg High, Houston, Texas). On the other end of the continuum, there are many schools that are bureaucratic and rule-centered. The balance of public school attendance centers, if all

could be evaluated, probably lies somewhere along the scale, with the majority tending to be more rule-centered than teacher-centered. This paper will attempt to make an analysis of the changes that will be necessary in the administration of schools that currently lie somewhat toward the rule-centered end of the continuum, with the explicit recognition that many schools or school systems may not be closer to the vision of the Carnegie model or further away.

To make the analysis more coherent, change will be categorized at three levels of education: schools, school districts, and the state. Several administrative task areas (i.e., management [organizational, motivational, personal], fiscal, legal, and curriculum) will be analyzed at each level. A final section will discuss issues in the training of future school administrators.

The School Level

The Carnegie report, and many other reform reports (i.e., A Nation at Risk, Action for Excellence,) view the individual school as the focal point for restructuring schools. The reports perceive a massive decentralization of the decision-making functions in the 16,000 districts in America. These functions may include shared decision-making, performance outcomes, differentiated personnel roles, locally determined curricula, mentor programs (both teacher and student), teacher evaluation and motivation, staff development, and most fiscal matters such as budgeting and expenditure control. It is hoped, and much of the current research tends to support the idea (Purkey and Smith), that the synergism that will come from the total effect of these changes will produce a revolution in student achievement. Obviously, this decentralization will require a quantitative leap in both the amount and type of

administration necessary at the school level. Thus, the initial analysis is made at this level.

Organizational Management

The greatest resource to be managed is teacher and student time, and the operant problem has been efficient utilization of it. Schools generally have been organized into what is often termed "lock-step," with both grades and courses organized to facilitate efficient, although not always effective, time usage. While reformers have decried this grade level organization for at least the last 50 years, the concept has shown remarkable resiliency. Perhaps with the use of modern technology, increased manpower, and a variety of what the Carnegie report terms "adjunct teachers," the grade level model can be replaced by one more suited to the 21st century. The following in an excerpt from the report that focuses on what the task force calls a market approach:

> A Market Approach. Market methods could also produce incentives for improved performance and productivity. Markets have proven to be very efficient instruments to allocate resources and motivate people in many sectors of American life. They can also make it possible for all public school students to gain equal access to school resources.
>
> There are a number of ways market approaches could be introduced in a school district. Some options are:
>
> - Creation of speciality schools with enrollments drawn from throughout the district.
> - Open enrollment among all public schools of a district could permit teachers and principals to develop very different schools. All schools would be equally accessible and the market would determine their viability.
> - Open enrollment could be extended across district lines. Students would take their local, state and federal funds with them, creating incentives for districts, as well as schools, to perform well and compete for their clientele. (p. 92).

If new organizational approaches such as those suggested are pursued, there is certainly no dearth of organizational models, e.g., team teaching, multi-graded, three on two, the little red school, the Red River system. The popularity of these methods for organizing schools has waxed and waned for reasons that run the gamut from staff resistance to lack of funds. For the school-level administrative team, the best management decision may be to resist "reinventing the wheel" and instead study the reasons these models have often been dropped, generating modifications that will make for long-term success.

However, if any of the models become operant in a school, it would appear that the administration will of necessity become more complicated, particularly in the secondary schools. Under current systems, the assignment of students to classes, classes to rooms, and teacher to classes has been a one-time planning activity. The schools of the future will require much more planning in terms of shifting groups of students (large-group, small-group and tutorials), moving groups of teachers to accommodate various learning modes, assigning space, etc. Planning will be on a short-term basis, weekly or even daily, and will involve groups of teachers and even students. While some of the work can be done by computer, the adjudication of competing demands for the use of certain types of space, i.e., large-group instructional areas, will still be a human problem. Therefore, negotiating skill as well as a clear vision of the overall mission of the school, will be prized attributes of the administrators (whether in teams or singly) who will be responsible for the smooth operation of these schools.

The Carnegie report has also suggested the overall reorganization of schools using a free choice model, rather than the more traditional concept of neighborhood boundaries. In other words, certain schools may be structured to fit the times of the day when parents will be able to participate in their children's educational experience or as a

year-around activity. (For a vast majority of the school districts in the U.S. the idea of free choice probably applies more frequently to elementary rather than secondary schools, since a large majority of the districts have only one high school.) One suggestion is to organize schools around preferred learning styles. In effect, parents would be able to send a child to a school which was organized along a particular style of interaction between teacher(s) and students. For instance, certain schools might feature strict discipline, heavy emphasis on homework, traditional teaching modes (often called traditional schools). Other schools might be much more laissez-faire, with self-paced learning, an emphasis on creativity, little drill or seat-work, and more student freedom. Still others might be structured around the Dewey philosophy of "learning by doing," with classrooms designed as miniature communities and most work done in teams. Each school would be staffed and administered by faculty who believed in and taught in a particular style. Parents would choose the learning/teaching style and thus the school; if a student's style matched the teacher's style, it is hypothesized that achievement would increase. Models include the South Minneapolis Project, Alum Rock, and schools such as the Pasadena Traditional School. However, new research into learning styles may widen the range of possible organizational styles.

Free choice models place strain on administration because they require that curriculum, staffing, and educational philosophy be carefully articulated. Changing the organization would require an immense school-parent relations campaign for which the principal would probably have to be the spokesperson. Outcome measurements would be essential since parents would need to know results to determine whether their children were in the schools that best fitted their learning styles. The management of major organizational change in school would require articulation with other units of the school system, as well as internally. All of this would take the highest degree of collegial planning and administrative leadership.

Motivational Management

One conclusion that might be drawn from a study of the recent social history of American public education is that great emphasis has not been placed on the teacher as an organizational decision maker. The Carnegie report, the Holmes Group and other reform literature perceive vastly increased teacher decision-making as the jewel in the crown of the schools of the future. The following succinctly states the Carnegie position.

> State and local policy makers should work with teachers to create schools that provide a professional environment for teaching.
>
> Teachers should be provided with the discretion and autonomy that are the hallmarks of professional work. State and local governments should set clear goals for schools and greatly reduce bureaucratic regulation of school processes. Teachers should participate in the setting of goals for their school and be accountable for achieving agreed upon standards of performance. (p. 56).

The reports also tend to talk most about new teachers while not spending much time on those who currently teach. No matter when the schools of the future are implemented, the large majority of the teachers will be those presently in the teaching ranks, most of whom have been socialized into the current system. Nearly all of these teachers have been involved in group planning activities throughout their teaching careers. Regardless of what the reform literature may suggest, there has been no dearth of cooperative planning activities. The problem has been one of unfulfilled expectations. Teachers begin cooperative activities with high hopes only to find that their ideas may not be feasible because of various rules and regulations or the lack of money to fund the programs. After a few of these episodes, disillusionment sets in. The

attitude becomes one of cynicism, which is rapidly transmitted to the less experienced staff.

There are at least two techniques that will not change this cynicism: (1) announcing to the teaching force through the literature that in the future they will be the decision makers; (2) having workshops on "how to plan" or on "taking charge of the planning in your school." Teachers will say, "We have been through all that before." What will be necessary is to remotivate teachers by a series of well planned and managed events constructed to guarantee success. The principal will be the kingpin of this effort.

The administrative aspects will be enormous. The principal and teacher leaders will face the task of raising teacher expectations on one hand and, on the other, meeting these expectations in a timely manner. The sequencing of these events is unclear. For instance, does requiring board certification (which will identify teacher leaders) come before the planning of curriculum and other school changes? Once teachers internalize the concept that they will really be in charge of the learning environment and curricula, there will be a rush to plan and execute changes. There is a such pent-up need for change that teachers will hurry up to carry out plans they may have forgone for years. Many of the plans will be costly. Thus, the administrative team will be faced with either serializing the plans (some for many years before execution) or having enough funds to put several into operation simultaneously.

This dilemma is one of the differences between public and private sector administration. In the private sector, the organizations can change extensively on fairly short notice because they can borrow money and they can operate at a loss until the new plans can take effect. Most public schools do not have such flexibility. The ability to change budgets after enactment is difficult. The ability to borrow large sums to augment operating expenses is often not possible. Generally, funding of schools is circumscribed by statutes. This is one of the aspects of school administration that tends

to frustrate executives from the private sector who have tried to administer public schools.

The management matters cited above do not exhaust the possibilities. For example, different models may be needed for small rural schools that may not accommodate team teaching, year-around schools, or proper educational placements under P.L. 94-142. In addition, care must be taken by administrators that strategies to allow freer choice of schools by parents do not inadvertently become a technique for the resegregation of schools.

In summary, it appears that the management of motivation at the school level will be very complex. Attempting to correlate rising expectations with organizational and fiscal constraints will be a true test of managerial skill. Perhaps states might be well disposed to fund a limited number of schools throughout the state to test the assumptions in the Carnegie report and to gather and analyze data for use by principals in other schools about the complexities of the process.

Leadership Role of Principals and Shared Decision Making

One of the major findings of the research on effective schools is the importance of the principal in increasing student achievement and improving school climate. The principal's ability to establish goals for a school, to articulate them clearly to staff and students, to maintain standards of discipline, and to expect high standards of achievement from students are key to school improvement. Perhaps that function will be taken over by the team leaders in the schools of the future. If so, the analogy of schools to other collegial organizations should be examined in an attempt to determine where the principal might fit into the curriculum and the personnel picture. The major aspect of the drive to restructure schools, as envisioned by the Carnegie report, is to develop a

more collegial atmosphere among the staff. In this regard the report says, in part:

> In most professional organizations those who are most experienced and highly skilled play the lead role in guiding the activity of others. We propose that districts create positions for a group of such people, designated "Lead Teachers," in each school. They would be selected from among experienced teachers who are highly regarded by their colleagues. Their role would be to guide and influence the activity of others, ensuring that the skill and energy of their colleagues is drawn on as the organization improves its performance.
>
> We do not envision Lead Teachers as assistant principals. Lead Teachers must create communities, not additional layers of bureaucracy to clog the system and frustrate their fellow teachers. Lead Teachers would derive their authority primarily from the respect of their professional colleagues. In such a relationship, teachers work together in a school, not separately in isolated classrooms; they take mutual responsibility for the curriculum and instruction on the basis of thinking together and individually about the substance of their work — children's learning — and how to make themselves better at it. They would also take collective responsibility for helping colleagues who were not performing up to par by arranging for coaching, technical assistance, coursework or other remediation that might be called for. (p. 58).

By far the largest aggregation of collegial units in the U.S. are found in universities; university departments may furnish the best example for the schools of the future. In the typical university, the colleagues (professors) meet to decide the department position on a number of policy issues. Once the positions have been determined, the professors turn the issues over to the chairperson who then becomes an administrator. The chair represents the department in budget hearings, personnel matters, relationships with other departments of the university, and in groups external to the university. Some chairpersons are elected. Others are appointed, either for a fixed number of years, or permanently. The methods employed to appoint department heads in universities are similar to the way principals are selected in the public schools.

If the university model were followed, the curriculum scenario might look like

this. Lead teachers would work with their teams to determine curriculum goals and a wide range of instructional techniques to implement them. The lead teacher and the principal would meet as colleagues (as a university chair might with the senior professors in a department) to reconcile differences in goals, establish time usage patterns, decide class assignments, and settle any other curriculum matters. Thereafter the roles would split. The teachers would take responsibility for achieving the agreed-upon outcomes, working in teams, interacting with other teams, etc. The principal would interact with groups outside the school (i.e., district level administrators, school board, and parents) to interpret the curriculum program and report progress toward the outcomes. Internally the principal would act as a coordinator rather than a distributor of resources, for example, providing educational assistants, coordinating the purchase of goods and services, and handling difficult discipline matters.

The leadership role of the principal would tend to become his/her ability to interpret the school to outside groups (i.e., community, administration) and enlist their support in achieving the outcomes. Principals would also play an oversight role, particularly in terms of learning experiences for special groups such as those covered by P.L. 94-142.

Fiscal Management

Decentralizing a large portion of the district budget and expenditure is another concept in the Carnegie report. This concept is congruent with modern management practice, which is to decentralize operating divisions into cost centers where managers have major expenditure control, and are then held accountable for the bottom-line results. The emphasis on placing expenditures close to the operating level is cited throughout the report. The following statements express this important aspect of the

plan:

> If the schools are to compete successfully with medicine, architecture, and accounting for staff, then teachers will have to have comparable authority in making the key decisions about the services they render. Within the context of a limited set of clear goals for students set by state and local policy makers, teachers, working together, must be free to exercise their professional judgment as to the best way to achieve these goals. This means the ability to make — or at least to strongly influence — decisions concerning such things as the materials and instructional methods to be used, the staffing structure to be employed, the organization of the school day, the assignment of students, the consultants to be used, and the allocation of resources available to the school. (p. 58).
>
> School-Site Budgeting and State Deregulation. It is essential to this plan that school staff be given freedom to determine how available resources will be used within constraints imposed by clearly stated goals and an effective accountability system. Principals now typically have very small discretionary funds. The services they need are generally located and controlled at the district level. In those circumstances, it is unreasonable to hold the principal and teachers responsible for the outcome. . . . Put another way, most of the budget for school district instructional services should be allocated to the school level, and the principal and teachers should together decide what services to buy and where. (p. 61).

Clearly if schools of the future are to be held accountable for outcomes like increased student achievement, better school climate, and lower drop out rates, they will need to have flexibility in purchasing certain inputs. The scope of the proposed decentralization is unclear at this time. But it seems that the Carnegie group intends decentralization to include at least funds to pay educational personnel, purchase of supplies, books, capital equipment, and contracted services. Maintenance and repair, capital improvements, and fixed costs may well be handled from a district level and will not be addressed in this discussion.

The techniques of budget determination may not change drastically. The current practice of many principals is to request instructional budgets by departments or grade levels. Under the decentralized system envisioned in the Carnegie report, requests by

team leaders may be more complicated since they may include additional personnel, in the form of educational assistants, and the possibility of contracting certain activities to outside sources. Under the old budget-generating system, such matters as increasing the number of personnel or expending large amounts on contracting were usually beyond the guidelines given to department chairpersons for budget requests. In the future they may become a prominent part of the requests.

Two other items that will have budgeting implications will be costs of evaluating faculty for individual pay-for-performance (merit) increases* and the external evaluation of the educational outcomes. It is possible that this cost could shift to the state if the state mandates goals that are to be met by schools. However, the Carnegie report also refers to locally generated outcomes that will need to be evaluated. Since the school patrons will be concerned with educational outputs in much the same way as stockholders are concerned with profit and loss, the outside evaluation reports would serve much the same function as a financial audit in a corporation. They may be a rather significant budget item for a single school.

In addition to the traditional budget documents and school test scores addressed above, the California Commission report also has suggested the publication of a biannual report entitled "Index of Conditions for Teaching and Training" which would provide information on such matters as class size and teaching load. The index would include teacher assignments outside the area of competence, time spent on non-teaching tasks, sufficiency of materials, safety and condition of the facilities, school order and climate, etc. (California Commission on the Teaching Profession, 1985). Such a report would enhance the quality of the documents by which the public could evaluate its schools.

There will have to be training for the teacher leaders in the area of budget

* See The Costs of Performance Pay Systems, Education Commission of the States, 1984, (TQ-84-4).

analyses and resolution. The method used in many schools today of essentially dividing the pie equally will not be successful in an output-driven school. Some type of zero-based budgeting — that is, having to justify one's entire budgetary request rather than only increases — may be more appropriate. While output measures will give indications of the need to shift resources within the school, analysis techniques such as cost utility studies may give better indications of the type and magnitude of human and fiscal resources that should be brought to bear to maximize change. Principals must be trained in the use of budget projection techniques, as well as the techniques cited above.

Financial Considerations

Expenditure control in American public education has gone from a very decentralized building-by-building model to a centralized system that places all units of a district under a single set of business practices. Many who have examined the schools are of the opinion that the effort, which has created standard operating procedures for expenditures, has tended to become rigid and is acting as a detriment to achieving goals of education. The Carnegie report and others recommend that the major budget and expenditure functions be placed in the individual attendance area. The purpose is to increase flexibility in expenditures and to reduce the time lag between an idea and its execution.

This concept has major implications for the entire control of the expenditure of public funds. Both the state and school districts will have to make changes which will be discussed later in this paper. This part of the paper will discuss school level concerns.

Implications of school reform recommendations imply major changes for school administration. One consideration will be the use of time. The principal, one of the other administrators, or perhaps an educational assistant will be involved with the

accounting function for expenditures.

Presently, educational expenditures are controlled by a set of accounting procedures that have been developed from a variety of sources including federal, state and (usually) district regulations. The effect of these accounting procedures in schools has been to lengthen the time necessary to order, procure, and occasionally even deliver materials needed in classrooms. From a public policy point of view the procedures assure strict accountability for the expenditure of public monies.

Without debating the propriety of the system, it appears that if a major purpose of decentralizing is to facilitate the purchase of needed materials and personnel then it will be necessary to train a large cadre of financial administrators. Also, if the principal is going to be responsible for carrying out or overseeing the operations, time will need to be allocated for that purpose.

Every state has regulations, often statutory, that control the bidding process used in the purchase of capital equipment. The purpose of this process is to encourage competition among vendors and assure the most economical purchase of goods. It also lengthens the time necessary to secure materials. For instance, in one state, textbooks must be requisitioned six months in advance of their intended use.

If bid specifications are to be prepared locally, then principals or others on the school staff will need to be trained. The courts are replete with suits which have stopped districts from remitting funds to vendors over improperly prepared or administered bids (Miller v. McKinnon, 124 P. 2nd 34).

The decentralization of personnel matters is another desirable feature of the schools of the future. The idea of operating schools along the lines of other professional organizations is both appealing and desirable. Having adequate support staff, educational assistants, etc. will give student achievement and teacher satisfaction a real boost. It will also occasion a major addition to the knowledge and skills of school administrators.

Knowledge of federal and state hiring and possible promotion regulations will be required. Skill will be required to negotiate employment agreements with a variety of employees who currently are hired under either a unit contract or district regulation.

One might argue that these are small points. Yet the effort by states and districts to assure wise use of public funds brought on the current centralization of the financial affairs of school districts. A number of states even purchase textbooks statewide to reduce costs. The need for school districts to organize rational expenditure policies or standard operating procedures is at the same time a major cause of frustration among teachers and others directly concerned with the delivery of service to students. The simple resolution would be to purchase at the school level and do accounting and bidding at the district level. Unfortunately, this will place schools in approximately the same position they are in currently, that is, under the tyranny of the business division. The more complicated alternative involves comprehensive training and additional administrative authority at the school level. The efficiency versus effectiveness argument is embedded in this issue very succinctly. The reconciliation of public policy questions, which tend to assure student expenditures by a set of specific rules, and the teacher's need for autonomy may well decide the future of the new wave of reform.

Personnel

The failure of school administrators, by and large, to help teachers improve their instructional techniques has been a sore point with teachers. It would appear that schools operated under the Carnegie model would avoid such controversy by shifting that responsibility to teacher leaders or mentors. This seems to be a most reasonable approach to this administrative dilemma. If schools are decentralized and the

administrative load on the principal increases, relief from certain tasks such as instructional supervision might be welcomed.

The part of the Carnegie report that envisions a National Board of Certification places much emphasis on the observation of the teachers in the instructional setting. Undoubtedly, the principal will be involved in the observing procedure. For, indeed, there are other aspects to being an outstanding teacher than simple interaction with students. A principal may be the key observer and reporter of activities such as the interaction of teachers with parents or community and professional groups. In fact, it may well be that the principal will observe experienced teachers more often under a board certification program than is presently the case.

In the unusual and always unpleasant task of recommending discharge of an incompetent teacher, a huge body of case law has placed legal responsibility on the principal to observe, counsel, and so forth before any action can be sustained. The Carnegie report intimates that a major responsibility for the professional behavior of teachers should be in the hands of their colleagues.

> In schools and districts in which Lead Teachers have assumed full responsibility for the school, they would be responsible for recommending dismissal, subject to established procedures. (p. 58).

Teachers may provide input for dismissal, but it appears that the final decision to recommend for or against dismissal will be the principal's responsibility.

The knowledge and skills in personnel relations as they apply to instructional matters will require constant sharpening. Both the legal and professional aspects of personnel administration will continue, and perhaps enlarge, in the schools of the future.

Legal Aspects

The responsibilities of the school administrator vis-a-vis judicially prescribed regulations may not change radically, but they are an important part of the overall success of any modern educational operation. While the list of possible interactions between the school and the judicial system is long, three areas are noted for the purpose of this paper.

1. Employment practice and affirmative action have been cited previously but bear repetition. Someone must be responsible for the strict enforcement of these statutes. If the model described in the Carnegie report becomes popular, it will be necessary to be certain that the executive group of teachers in a building is knowledgeable in this regard. Otherwise, they run the risk that their employment decisions will be overturned at a higher level.

2. The same is true for the protection of the constitutionally prescribed rights of students (and teachers). While it is possible to change the organizational structure of schools or administrative assignments, it is not possible (at least in the short run) to reverse or modify the legal responsibilities placed on public schools by the courts. While, in theory, everyone in a school is responsible for protecting students' constitutional rights, it often doesn't work that way. Traditionally the principal has either assumed or been given the responsibility for protecting student rights. In the sharing of authority that will characterize the schools of the future this responsibility must be clearly defined and not allowed to slip through the cracks.

3. In the area of tort liability for negligence, the role of the principal will

continue to be pivotal. While this is an aspect of school administration for which all teachers should be trained, the judgments for torts of negligence that occur in the public areas of the campus have generally fallen onto the principal. A number of states have modified the common law principle of sovereign immunity so that the principal may not be personally liable for awards in tort action. However, the necessity to provide leadership in the prevention of tort for which a board of educators may be financially liable if a suit is filed is still an important aspect of the principal's work.

Providing a proper supervisory plan to prevent negligent injury to students during recess, after school, and so forth will still fall to the principal in the schools of the future. Principals must have the authority to designate teachers to handle these responsibilities. If teachers perceive this as a nonprofessional duty, then conflict may exist. The ability to shift this duty to noncertified personnel varies from state to state. Many courts have found that teachers, because of their ability to foresee problems with students, are the ideal persons to supervise playgrounds. Principals have responsibility for preventing injury in the public areas of the school, so they must have authority to assign teachers to implement the supervision plans necessary to prevent torts.

Curriculum

Teacher organizations such as the NEA and AFT have often criticized the principal for failing to be a leader in matters of curriculum. The Carnegie report tends to shift curriculum matters to the teachers while leaving the outside role to the principal. This may go far in reducing tension between teachers' unions and principals.

There are several definitions of the word curriculum in educational circles, and

several ways to define roles. If curriculum is defined as the scope and sequence of how students learn to learn in a particular branch of knowledge, the central role will be played by the professional teacher. Likewise, decisions on the materials and techniques to aid in these matters are the unique responsibility of teachers. But sometimes the curriculum is defined as the totality of the social, emotional, and academic experiences that students have in school. These include such factors as a safe environment conducive to learning, an identity to and with the school, an opportunity to engage in social interactions outside of the classroom (athletics, clubs, dances, etc.). This second group of variables is essentially what the research on effective schools has identified with successful schools. Purkey and Smith have said, for example, that the principal appears to be the key to fostering a climate which strengthens this aspect of the curriculum (Purkey and Smith, 1985). It would appear that the role of administering the curriculum in the schools of the future will expand to include the teachers and the administration in a partnership that will enhance student achievement in the school.

Schools of the future will be complex organizations with more authority to achieve the goal of educating (not training) students to compete in a new and more challenging world in the 21st century. Successfully decentralizing the locus of authority will require teachers as well as principals who are willing and able to establish worthwhile goals and carry them out cooperatively.

The District Level

The schools of the future may significantly change the administrative roles at the district level. During the past 20 years, district administration has increased more rapidly than student enrollment, the number of teachers, or school level administrative

personnel. Two reasons for the increase stand out: the demands for accountability in the federal programs and the centralizing tendency in such areas as business practices, the effects of collective bargaining, increased state regulation (e.g., transportation), and the need for special programs for culturally and economically diverse student groups.

These centralizing tendencies, with their accompanying bureaucracy, have enabled schools to maintain credible programs with limited resources. However, this tendency has also led to frustration at the lower levels of the bureaucracy, particularly for teachers, since it has often led to delays in getting needed educational supplies, very tight constraints on the types of supplies secured, demands on teachers and principals to complete lengthy paperwork, and often rigid adherence to inflexible schedules. In addition, decisions have often been made at the top with little input from the school level.

The reformers have placed great emphasis on the need to decentralize the decision making process, including participation in the budget and expenditures process as a prerequisite to attracting high-quality college graduates to the teaching profession.

If school boards desire to implement the decentralized school models described in the Carnegie report, they will have to come to grips with the vexing problem of how many and what management decisions can be assigned to the schools versus those which must remain centralized. If not enough authority, particularly in the area of fiscal decisions, is transferred to the individual schools, then the model envisioned in the report will not come to full function.

For central district administrators the change may be more traumatic than for boards, because they will have the ultimate responsibility with relatively less authority. Yet, if reformers are correct that massive organizational change will be necessary to upgrade the quality of the teacher corps, then internalizing and planning the new era will be necessary.

Management

For a number of boards and central administrators the likelihood of schools within the district having very different organizational patterns may present management problems. For boards of education the act of rescinding work rules that have tended to maintain equity across schools in terms of time spent on teaching may be a problem. This is a fundamental change from what the Carnegie report refers to as the "blue collar" organization of schools toward a professional, output-oriented school system. The cliche taken from industry might be, "They work by the job not by the hour." Since output measures will be measured at one- or two-year intervals, boards will have to place their faith in the professional judgment of school level personnel in attaining the state, district and school level goals.

Central administration will, by necessity, become interested in the validity and reliability of output measures. The measures may well differ from school to school, but the total evaluations will have to reflect the goals of the district as well as the schools. If adequate performance is not forthcoming from certain schools, the district will either have to take action or be willing to have the state send in technical assistance teams. Since the positions of the leadership groups will rest on the output evaluations (which the report indicates must include more than standardized tests and could involve attendance rates, dropout, job placement and college acceptance, parent satisfaction among others), developing techniques that will adequately capture such data must become a very high priority.

Financial Considerations

School districts may have a multitude of problems with the concept of individual schools becoming cost centers with decentralized budgeting and expenditures. Boards have a fiduciary responsibility for the proper and prudent expenditure of district funds, which in some states is a legal responsibility. For example, in many states, contracts are not ratified until they appear in the minutes of the board. Decentralizing expenditures into the schools would make it most difficult to examine the merits of contractual agreements. Yet if districts require contracts to be scrutinized by the business division, they may in effect have veto power over school level expenditures.

State statutes on bid procedures for the purchase of capital goods likewise present a problem. If principals write the specifications, they will have to be approved by the board who will have the responsibility for the proper form and correct bid procedures. In this circumstance, boards may choose not to decentralize this function.

In any case, for boards and central administration, the release (or partial release) of the centralized expenditure accounting policies may be a most difficult decision to make. This is particularly true for districts with limited resources.

Legal Concerns

The legal responsibilities of boards and school districts may not change radically. The fiduciary relationship between the state and the district undoubtedly will remain the same. In most states the contracts negotiated by the agents of the board (principals, teachers, etc.) must be ratified by the boards. Once the decentralization of budgeting and expenditure is accomplished (as the Carnegie report envisions), boards will have to be certain that all parties understand this relationship and be willing to give some degree of latitude to their agents.

Unless legislatures and the courts can be persuaded that the new era in schooling should place responsibility for compliance with state and federal statutes at a different level of the system, boards will still have oversight requirements for fair employment practices, 94-142 placements, attendance, teacher employment, safe place statutes and a host of other matters.

The central theme of the Carnegie report is that professionals should be given more latitude and bureaucracy reduced. This will mean that boards will have fewer people to assist them in their oversight responsibilities. The flattened pyramid of the organizational structure will put boards into more direct contact with the operating units of the school district. In large school districts, this will mean that a much larger group of administrative personnel (principals, lead teachers, etc.) will have to be well trained in the legal responsibilities that courts and legislatures have delegated to boards or school districts. Concomitantly it will require boards to place more trust in school level administration than has often been the case heretofore.

Curriculum

Perhaps little will change for boards in the area of curriculum. Traditionally they have left the content and mode of teaching to the professionals. Some boards may be assailed by patrons of the district if questionable books or films are used in the schools. However, this is not very different from the present circumstances. The boards will always have a legal right to veto objectionable materials. But if they wish to create a professional atmosphere for teaching staff and building administrators, they will have to use their power sparingly.

The State Level

It is often stated that is is easier to add new statutes than it is to revise old ones. Yet if the administrative aspects of the Carnegie report are to be enacted, and without them the concept is probably doomed to failure, then revising the current statutes and regulations will be a necessity.

Management and Fiscal Considerations

It is clear that to decentralize the administrative structure of public schools will cost money. This money will be independent of the costs necessary to bring teacher and administrator salaries into a competitive position, or to create career ladders. The money referred to above must be spent on a variety of training costs for workshops, consultants, extra time in summer months for planning and a many other costs of reorganization. Many districts will be unable to fund the marginal costs of restructuring. If the new brand of schools is to become a reality, then it appears that state funds will be necessary.

The method of distributing funds to schools is worthy of attention. Since all districts will not be ready to implement the concepts described in the Carnegie report during the same school year, the funding may have to take the form of project or grant awards. In the initial stage, a state might elect to fund a group of experimental schools whose experience with the new system could be used to determine which models appear to have the greatest potential. Using experiments in this manner would also give researchers and legislators an opportunity to decide which statutes or regulations need revision in order to make the state ready for large-scale implementation.

It will be important to write the funding statute for the experimental schools with

parameters that will assure that schools of various size, location and financial ability are included. The proposals should establish a contractual relationship between the school board and the state. The costs to develop the administrative portion of schools of the future would be one-time costs. Once the administrative aspects of decentralizing the schools had been changed, the district would fund the ongoing costs. (This should not, however, include funding for career ladder teachers, since it might take years for a district or the current state support system to absorb these additional costs.)

An additional concern legislators need to be aware of is equity among districts. Often the wealthiest school districts are most able to put resources into writing proposals for change, and they often can contribute the most district resources to the establishment of a new, less centralized system of schools. Thus, often these districts are most successful in receiving money for reform ideas. They are also the districts that may have the highest percentage of board-certified teachers. If the state pays a percentage of the additional costs for these high-cost teachers, the wealthy districts may be able to secure money that will enable them to contract more board-certified teachers, thus improving the instruction in their schools at the expense of districts that are poorer and less able to reward teacher excellence.

This situation presents a dilemma. It appears that the states will have to pay the costs for changing current schools into schools of the future. In the process, the states may be promoting a lack of equity. Certainly states do not wish to retard the necessary changes by awarding every district the same amount of money, (a flat grant system). On the other hand, states may not wish to promote inequity by an open proposal policy.

Perhaps weighing improvement funds by the ability of a district to fund its educational needs is the best solution. Awards might be made in an inverse ratio to district wealth. One strategy might be to give enough so that improvement is encouraged, while not allowing the "rich districts to get richer."

Legal Aspects

In the area of instruction, statutes or state regulations that require a certain number of hours or minutes of instruction per week or month or year in certain subjects may need to be revised. The subjects could stay, but the prescribed time would go.

Statewide textbook adoptions, which may limit the creativity of the teaching force, might have to be changed, although not necessarily eliminated.

As the Carnegie report stresses, the certification laws for teachers and administrators may have to be revised.

Statewide salary maximums (where they exist) and perhaps minimums would be eliminated.

In several states statutes that prescribe accounting and expenditure procedures may have to be scrutinized to determine whether they conform to the intentions of decentralized financial decision making.

The revision of statutes will be clearly affected by the reality that not all schools and districts will be ready to move into the mode described in the Carnegie report at the same time. Should statutes be revised to fit the schools of the future when there may still be a number of schools of the present? Or should a different mechanism be used to assist schools that are forging ahead? One possibility would be to grant waivers where that would aid schools to achieve the more professionalized status envisioned in the report. A statute that would empower the state department to grant such waivers upon application, review, and approval may be a viable alternative.

Curriculum

The state education agency must take the lead in developing rational goals or outcomes for districts. In that sense it will be producing a mission statement to guide the educational destiny of the state.

Statutory enactments that prescribe instruction in particular parts of the curriculum, i.e., "one hour of instruction per year on the history and meaning of Arbor Day," will have to be reviewed to determine their relevance in an era of a new and vastly different educational system.

Also, the legislature will have to review laws and regulations on matters such as accounting procedures, budgets and contracts, teacher and administrator certification, subject area requirements for students, the school year, and governance of schools. The report makes clear the concept that a professionalized teaching force will not flourish in an overly regulated educational environment.

In summary, the role of the state legislature and of the department of public instruction will grow as the Carnegie model is implemented. Appropriating money to facilitate the changes discussed in this paper, as well as others not described, will be necessary. Perhaps even more important will be to develop a funding mechanism that promotes equity.

Training of Administrators

If the educational enterprise is decentralized, the result will be more, not less, administration. Functions that are currently centralized will be spread over a larger number of people.

> School Leadership and the Role of the Principal. No organization can function well without strong and effective leadership and schools are no exception. . . . The model of a non-teaching principal as head of the school can work in support of the collegial style of schooling we propose, but there are many other models that should be tried. Among them are schools headed by the Lead Teachers acting as a committee, one of whom acts like a managing partner in a professional partnership. In such schools, the teachers might hire the administrators, rather than the other way around. (p. 61).
>
> It would be far more efficient to establish most school district instructional and other services as "cost centers" which have to sell their services to the schools in order to survive. Put another way, most of the budget for school district instructional services should be allocated to the school level, and the principal and teachers should together decide what services to buy and where. (p. 61).

More people will be involved in decisions about the curriculum, discipline and personnel selection, budgeting and expenditures to name a few. Thus, decision makers will have to determine who will require training, as well as what kind of training is needed. This section of the paper will look at some of the concerns that may arise in the area of administrative training.

There appears to be a blurring of distinction between selection and training of administrators in the reform literature. The research being carried out by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and to a lesser extent by states like South Carolina seems to indicate that certain attributes, which can be identified and in some cases honed, are related to success in the administrative role. This is welcome news, but it does not follow that the need for training is any less. Given the realities of decentralization, there will probably be a need for additional training, not less. The Carnegie report argues that simply graduating a prospective teacher with a strong liberal education does not obviate the need for pedagogical training (Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, pp. xx). The same argument may be advanced about training administrators.

It is probably possible to learn how to administer schools by experience alone. However, most people do not perceive that method to be the most effective. Thus, while clinical experience is a vital part of an administrative training program, it should not be interpreted as the training program. Likewise, while bringing in successful industrialists to speak on certain aspects of their expertise can be part of training, it has limitations. For example, an expert in the field of motivation may have almost nothing to say about legal aspects of school administration.

Another point is to recognize that there are two distinct types of training for administrators (as there are for teachers): pre-service and in-service. These two vary considerably in terms of scope, timing, lag time between the training and possible application, and the site-specificity.

Pre-Service Training

Pre-service training ideally should begin with a selection procedure such as the NASSP Assessment Centers, to winnow out people who do not appear to have the skills to be an administrator. A second step would be to have candidates enrolled in some type of regional training center. University faculties have traditionally conducted this phase of training and probably should continue to do so, with appropriate changes in the curriculum, methods of instruction and, in some cases, the time of the training.

Research seems to indicate that studying pedagogy concurrently with experiences in a field setting (the classroom) produces greater receptivity and better understanding. Undoubtedly, the same would be true in the pre-service training of administrators. Since a large majority of those aspiring to become administrators have been practicing teachers, it has not been feasible to have them leave the classroom to spend time in administration. However, in the school of the future, people who aspire to be

administrators could probably spend part of their day in pre-service training.

This partial experience should not be confused with internships, which should follow the training and be a fulltime experience. Several states require an internship as part of the licensing procedure for teachers, and it should certainly be a phase of administrator training. There are problems connected with these internships. If an intern experience is to be fruitful, it should be conducted by a mentor with demonstrated leadership qualities. A board made up of practitioners and professionals should identify prospective placements.

Many interns will not be able to carry out their internships in their own community. Therefore, decision makers interested in better schools will have to consider techniques to partly or fully fund internships. The costs will be different from the costs referred to in the Carnegie report of funding internships for prospective teachers: the total cost for all teacher interns in a given year will be much larger, but the per-intern amount will be higher for administrator interns. (The reason is that interning administrators are practicing teachers with families and other financial responsibilities.) It is true that these internships will have, in economic terms, both public and private benefits. The proportion that these benefits assume should be the basis for the award of money to the intern. Also, awards should be made based on whether the intern will be sent to another district or remain at home. To ask a school district to assume these costs presents several problems. First, many of the interns will not be hired by the district. Second, wealthier districts will be able to fund interns more easily than poor districts.

Since high quality in the leadership of schools is a statewide concern, the state should take an active interest in a funding arrangement for interns. The alternatives for funding with any number of combinations appear reasonable. Since private industry, almost by definition, must be interested in administration, industry might establish an

intern fund administered by the state. There are advantages to this alternative because a variety of enterprises can contribute. Currently, many school-business partnerships occur within a school district, that is, if an industry located in a particular city will work with that school district. Such arrangements may promote inequality, because some districts have no industries. A fund idea such as this is manageable because the scope is relatively small but the potential payoff is good. Also, a state may allocate money from its general funds for an intern payment plan. This has the advantage of equity, but it might be subject to reduction in difficult budgetary years. Finally, a charitable institution may wish to undertake such a venture.

Criticism of the pre-service training of administrators is generally of two types. One is that some coursework does not apply to the principalship. Another is that instructional methodology occasionally seems uni-dimensional. Both of these problems must be corrected if pre-service training of administration is to contribute to the schools of the future.

While it is beyond the scope of this paper to suggest how pre-service programs might be restructured, some comments based upon the four areas described above may be in order.

In terms of management, training must be designed to maximize its impact on those who will be the leaders of the schools of the future. In the area of organizational management, one thing seems clear — there will be a number of different ways to organize schools. The rather monolithic model currently in place will not be satisfactory for the end of the 20th century. The dynamics of restructuring the organization of a school to a faculty team, a non-graded approach, or a school based upon a certain learning style will require both research and training. Training in this aspect of administration (whether it is for a principal or an executive group of teachers or both) may well look at discrepancies or dysfunctions in such matters as time on task, formal

linkages with other organizations, relationships between the professional and certified positions of the staff. Knowing how to transform instructional goals into efficient organizational structure will be necessary to the administration of the future.

Pre-service training in financial matters will have to be geared to the school level. Studies of the micro-models of resource allocation (such as time on task studies) and training in financial analysis techniques (such as cost utility, cost benefit, trend analysis, and input/output studies) will be essential if the school becomes output- rather than process-oriented.

In the area of personnel, a heavy emphasis on collegial management models will serve prospective administrators well. Developing skills in classroom observation will also be very useful.

Perhaps one of the most important training needs will be in the area of output evaluation. Introduction to the design of evaluation studies, interpretation of research data, techniques of carrying out such studies, and sampling theory will assume a major importance in an output-oriented school. Traditional statistics courses probably will not be suited for the tasks that principals will be required to do, but new courses that tie the use of data to a system of analysis that has relevance to school level administrators will have great value.

State decision makers will have to require universities to evaluate their policies on residence credit so that professors can carry on training courses in regional centers. This will allow prospective and practicing administrators to take courses while they are carrying out their teaching/administrative duties.

In-Service Training

While much of the pre-service education of administrators may occur in universities and colleges, the retraining of administrators currently in service may require different techniques and organization. The traditional 18-week semester favored by universities or even the 6- or 8-week summer sessions may not be an appropriate vehicle for the delivery of this important training or retraining.

On the other hand, there is increasing evidence that the one- or two-day workshop that has been the mainstay of staff development activities in public schools does little, if anything, to effect lasting change. It would appear that an organizational structure that delivers training to practicing administrators will have to be developed with a time frame somewhere between a university course and a workshop. Two promising models are the academies operated by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the California School Administrators.

In any case, there will be costs to be borne by the state for the establishment and operation of these in-service academies. The other alternative is to require school administrators to pay for their own training. This would likely result in a disjointed set of workshops that do not produce the required results. While the costs to operate these retraining centers (which could be done by universities, if they can bring themselves to reorganize delivery services, by private corporations, or by the Regional Labs sponsored in part by the National Institute for Education) will not be large in relation to the total for implementing the Carnegie model(s). But they will be vital to the success of the new professionalized educational system.

If the schools of the future as they are envisioned in the Carnegie report are to become a reality, then the need for competent well-trained and motivated administrators will be a prime necessity. If administration either singly or in groups is to be of high quality, then selection of talented individuals should be encouraged through selection

procedures and methods to assist them financially to receive pre-service training. If prospective administrators are to be completely trained, then pre-service training methods should include university study and internships with outstanding practitioners. If practicing administrators are to be retrained, then new models such as principal academies should be designed and implemented. If these training methodologies are to become reality, then state legislatures will be the most likely source of funding and they must build in such costs to their planning efforts. Failure to provide adequate funding of this small but vital part of the school improvement model may very well jeopardize the entire enterprise.

Policy Implications

No effort has been made in this paper to repeat the policy implications that were written into the Carnegie study that precipitated this working paper. It should be pointed out, however, that many of those implications have clear and important ramifications for the future administration of public schools. For instance, the establishment of a National Professional Standards Board will undoubtedly have a significant effect upon school level administration. The principal will become involved in the observations of prospective Board teachers as well as the recommendation on various aspects of professional practice.

The implications that follow concern such matters as legislating decentralization, the need for changes in certification, and the need to carefully consider not only the level of funding necessary but the regulation of the flow of money to achieve maximum results.

1. Decentralizing various functions of the teaching and learning process will not lead to a reduction in the need for administration of the schools. It will instead require more administration, since many of the functions (curricular, financial and personnel) that have become centralized will return to the schools.

The policy options that consider the state role in the training and retraining of a very large number of administrators, i.e., existing and prospective principals as well as lead teachers who will be assuming administrative functions in schools that adopt certain of the models in the Carnegie report, will need to be examined. The ability of many districts to fund such training is limited. State resources to assist in defraying the costs must be considered.

2. Legislating the decentralization of functions such as governance, scope and sequence of the curriculum, and budget and expenditure will be a formidable task. However, leaving it in the hands of boards of education is even a greater problem for several reasons.

(a) There is an administrative structure in place that reflects a philosophy of centralizing certain functions, for better accountability or to save money. While it may be relatively easy conceptually to see how a more open system might accommodate teachers' needs for professionalism, the complexities of actual change may be more than boards are willing to undertake. For example, placing the responsibility for employing personnel in the hands of the teachers may seem like a fine idea, but for a board to generate the effort necessary to change current regulations, lobby for changes in state statutes, have each school develop preference lists, train many school level administrators and teachers about equal employment

regulations and monitor compliance may overwhelm a board. If one multiplies this list by several other lists of particulars necessary to change; purchases, budgets, district boundaries of individual schools, and many other tasks, it is clear that many boards may wish to change but lack the energy. Intense and sustained motivation by educational leaders in a state will be a key ingredient for success.

(b) Many school districts do not have the funds necessary to change to a decentralized system. The argument advanced in the Carnegie report that much of the cost could be underwritten by the elimination of central level administrators is specious. The centralization of many administrative functions were initiated to conserve resources. Decentralizing them will require additional funding, not less. If asked to accomplish this within their current financial structure, a large majority of districts will simply be unable to do so.

(c) Over a long term, the costs-to-benefits ratio will be positive; unfortunately, boards of education are often required by statute or practice to work with very short budget cycles, which tend to promote quick fixes rather than long term benefits.

(d) Currently there are relatively few models of the process that a district might use to bring about schools with the characteristics described in the Carnegie report or the product — that is, what the system should be when the process is complete. Designs that have promise need to be developed and tested. School boards must have the choice among several

possibilities to avoid a new monolithic model for schools which will replace the old monolithic system. The suggestion in this paper is that the state rather than districts will have to provide the risk capital necessary to design, plan, and implement several models. Each state will have its own needs, but models for large and small schools and for urban, suburban, rural schools may be among those needed.

3. The drive toward equalizing educational opportunity among districts has created tendencies toward single rather than duplicate outcomes in matters which run the gamut from graduation requirements to equalizing district tax effort and expenditure. Retaining these worthwhile goals, which clearly tend toward centralization, while decentralizing many other educational functions will require skill on the part of legislators. One theme that runs through this entire paper is the complexity of preserving diversity in organization, financing, employment, curriculum, while attempting to assure some standardizing of educational outcomes. Legislating change may not be as effective as motivating it.

4. State certification standards for both teachers and school administrators will have to be revised. The Carnegie report makes many suggestions on this matter for teachers which do not bear repeating in these paper. In the schools of the future, administrator credentials may be a misnomer. If a school has many persons with various degrees of administrative responsibility, as the Carnegie report suggests, then who should be credentialed? Perhaps no one. Instead it may be that training in and knowledge of administrative tasks may be part of the requirement to become a board-certified teacher. Thus, the national certifying board may replace the traditional state credential.

5. Since not all districts will be ready (and even willing) to change the structure and functions of their districts simultaneously, a method of funding to facilitate the change at a time when districts are ready will have to be devised. If this is not done, much of the money may be wasted. The suggestions made on pages 24-26 of this paper may be among the possibilities to make the best use of government funds.

6. Relieving schools that are moving toward implementation of one of the Carnegie models (see pages 87-94 of the Carnegie report) from state regulations or statutes which may restrict their implementation efforts will be a policy consideration at the state level. Since some schools will not move as rapidly as others, the current statutes may be necessary for some years to come. The suggestion made in this paper is to create a waiver system for schools that need relief from statutes and regulation to achieve their goals. Safeguards such as applications which spell out specifics of a school's plan, observation by an oversight body, and subsequent reapplication will need to be part of such a waiver plan.

7. The reconciliation of measuring outcomes by some standard or partly by standardized measure while encouraging diversity in local educational inputs will require great care at either the legislative or department of public instructional level. The Council of Chief State School Officers is beginning to address that question with its "Indicators of Excellence" program.

8. Programs for both pre-service and in-service training of administrators will have to be both enlarged and changed. Distinctions between selection, pre-service

training, appointment to positions and in-service training (and retraining) need to be made more clear. Innovative programs such as the National Secondary School Principal selection program, the University Council of Educational Administrators' study on training, South Carolina's effort to match skills to educational positions, and the California Career Academies may provide decision-makers with guidelines in this area.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper has been to alert policy makers to some of the implications for the administration of public schools that are implicit in the Carnegie report. Many administrators and school board members are asking what their role will be in the schools of the future. There are suggestions for a new and expanded role for building administrators in this paper. These new responsibilities will require new role definitions, different relationships, and increased, though shared, authority.

Many new models for operating schools to enhance the achievement of students will have to be created. Costs to implement the models throughout the schools of a state will be substantial. But so will gains for students.

To sustain the current momentum for change will present a challenge for policy makers. The final question is how it will be done and by whom. The future of public education may lie in how that question is answered.

Selected References

Berger, M.A. Two Paradoxes in Managing Doctrine: Comprehensive Planning and Participation. National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., 1983.

Brookever, W. et al. Creating Effective Schools. Holmes Beach Florida Learning Publications, 1982.

California Commission on the Teaching Profession. Who Will Teach Our Children? A Strategy for Improving California's Schools. 1985.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. 1986.

Crockenberg, V. and V. Clark. "Teacher Participation in School Decision Making. The San Jose Teacher Involvement Project." Phi Delta Kappan, October 1979.

Edmonds, R.R. "Some Schools and More Can." Social Policy, 9, 1979.

Education Commission of the States, Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, Action for Excellence. 1983.

Finn, C. "A Principal's Leadership in Developing the Characteristics of Excellent Schools." National Association of Catholic Educational Association. Washington, D.C., 1985.

Hersey, Paul and K. L. Blanchard. Management of Organizational Behaviors: Utilizing Human Resources, 4th edition. Prentice Hall, 1982.

The Holmes Group. Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, Michigan, 1986.

Lake, S. "Quality Circles ERIC Highlights for School Administrators." California Association of School Administrators, EO238607.

Levin, B. and M. Cohn. Levels of State Aid Related to State Restrictions on Local School District Decision Making. Urban Institute, 1973.

Muir, W.N. "Teacher Regulation of the Classroom." California Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance. 1985

National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation At Risk. 1983.

Peddiwell, J. Abner. The Saber-tooth Curriculum, Including Other Lectures in the History of Paleolithic Education. McGraw-Hill: New York, 1939.

Purkey, S.C. and M.S. Smith. "Effective Schools: A Review," The Elementary School Journal, 38, 4, 427-452, 1985.

Thomas, W. and A.W. Edgemon. "Reviewing Participatory Management: An Action Research Program for Secondary Schools." NASSP Bulletin, December 1984.

Weingast, David. "Shared Leadership — The Damn Thing Works." Educational Leadership, March 1980.